

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,605	07/16/2003	Mitsuyoshi Watanabe	1614.1345	6534
21171 CTAAC & HAI	7590 09/06/2007	6/2007 EXAMINER		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700			BASIT, ABDUL	
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	JN, DC 20003		3694	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/619,605	WATANABE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Abdul Basit	3694			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the state of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 10.	epted or b) objected to by the formal drawing (s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing (s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 10/619,605

Art Unit: 3694

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the amendment filed on June 7, 2007. Claims 1-10 are pending.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

- 1. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/7/2007 have been fully considered.
- 2. In response to Applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of claims 1-9, claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 USC 103. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 102(e).
- 3. Applicant's amendment to include new matter into claims1, 7, 8, and 9 requires a new search and therefore renders Applicant's arguments moot.
- 4. Applicant has added claim 10 that requires a new search and therefore renders Applicant's arguments moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kelman (US Pat. No. 6,850,896).

Kelman teaches a sales support information providing method comprising:

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/619,605

Art Unit: 3694

- Extracting sales records for a product, including a shop ID and attributes of a shop corresponding to said shop ID, and incrementing, for each extracted sales record, a count for a plurality of attribute groups each having an attribute matching an attribute corresponding to a shop ID corresponding to a requesting salesperson; and
- Transmitting results of the extracting and incrementing to a terminal of the requesting salesperson.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1,7, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodd (US Pub. No. 2003/0036978) in view of Kelman (US Pat. No. 6,850,896).

Kelman, not Dodd, teaches shop ID numbers and salesperson ID numbers. (see 5. Colm 2 gerelly,

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Dodd with Kelman. Motivation to modify exists because use of identification numbers helps to provide a more efficient sales management system.

Claims 1, 7, 8, and 9 remain rejected.

Application/Control Number: 10/619,605

Art Unit: 3694

3. Claims 2, 3, and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodd in view of Kelman and in further view of Lu et al. (US Pat. No. 5,331,544) and in further view of Kelman.

Other than the amendment, Applicant provides no arguments other than claims 2, 3 and 4 should be allowable because claim 1 is allowable. Applicant provides no arguments as to motivation or obviousness to further modify Dodd with Lu. Because claim 1 has been rejected claims 2, 3 and 4 also remain rejected.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodd in view of Kelman and in further view of Johnson (US Pat. No. 6,067,525).

Other than the amendment, Applicant provides no arguments other than claim 5 should be allowable because claim 1 is allowable. Applicant provides no arguments as to motivation or obviousness to further modify Dodd with Johnson. Because claim 1 has been rejected claim 5 also remain rejected.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodd in view of Kelman, in further view of Johnson (US Pat. No. 6,067,525) in further view of Carol B. MacKnight's article, "Teaching critical thinking through online discussions (2000).

Other than the amendment, Applicant provides no arguments other than claim 6 should be allowable because claim 1 is allowable. Applicant provides no arguments as to motivation or obviousness to further modify Dodd with MacKnight. Because claim 1 has been rejected claim 5 also remain rejected.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/619,605

Art Unit: 3694

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdul Basit whose telephone number is 571 272-7246. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571 272 6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

aqb

MISORY PATENT EXAMINE